



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,059	09/26/2001	Tony Nick Frudakis	0201-0001	1445

33787 7590 12/04/2003

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ.  
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER  
980 N. MICHIGAN AVE.  
SUITE 1400  
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER

KENEDY, ANDREW A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

14

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,059

Applicant(s)

FRUDAKIS, TONY NICK

Examiner

Andrew A. Kenedy

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 14 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1-2 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A).

Vijg et al. teaches a method and a computer-usable storage medium containing computer-readable program code for processing gene sequence data and haplotyping comprising reading, by the computer, gene sequence data corresponding to a gene sequence and coding sequence data corresponding to a plurality of coding sequences within the gene sequence; identifying, by the computer following a set of primer selection rules, primer pair data within the gene sequence data, the primer pair data corresponding to a pair of primer sequences for one of the coding sequences, the set of primer selection rules including a first rule specifying that the primer pair data be obtained for a predetermined annealing temperature, and a first rule further specifying that each primer sequence have a length that falls within one or more limited ranges of acceptable lengths; storing the primer pair data; repeating the acts of identifying and storing such that primer pair data are obtained for each sequence of the plurality of coding sequences at the predetermined annealing temperature; and simultaneously amplifying the plurality of coding sequences in gene sequences from three or more individuals at the predetermined annealing temperature using the identified pairs of primer sequences, such that a plurality of amplified

Art Unit: 1631

coding sequences from the three or more individuals are obtained (see at least Fig. 6A and 6B; column 3, line 30 through col. 4, line 33; and col. 6, lines 12-62). Note that while Vijg et al. do not directly state that their method is applied to three or more individuals, they do state that their method obviates the large-scale genotyping problem of "a large number of individuals to be tested and when more than one gene is tested simultaneously in the same TDGS test" (col. 3, lines 41-43; and col. 5, lines 23-25). Predating Vijg et al., Perlin (US 5580728 A) describes a simultaneous sequence amplification method for genotyping, wherein Perlin states that by large-scale genotyping, what is meant is "hundreds or thousands of individuals" (col. 3, lines 55-57). As such, by stating "a large number of individuals to be tested...simultaneously in the same TDGS test", Vijg et al. can be fairly interpreted to mean simultaneous amplification of sequences from three or more individuals.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3, 17 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) in view of Vijg et al. (US 5814491 A).

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) is applied as above.

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) does not teach the set of primer selection rules as including a second rule specifying that a single primer pair be identified for two or more coding regions if they are sufficiently close together.

Vijg et al. (US 5814491 A) teaches a method of processing gene sequence data comprising a primer selection rule specifying that a single primer pair be identified for two or more coding regions if they are sufficiently close together (col. 6, lines 21-26).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add a second primer selection rule to the primer selection rules of Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A), specifying that a single primer pair be identified for two or more coding regions if they are sufficiently close together, since using a single primer pair for two or more coding regions sufficiently close together will reduce the overall number of amplicons to be amplified in simultaneous/multiplex PCR reactions, which is advantageous according to Vijg et al. (US 5814491 A) who teaches that for multiplexing, "limitations to primer choice, with total genomic DNA as template, are the reasons why multiplex groups are usually small (typically less than 5 fragments)" (col. 4, lines 19-22).

Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A), in view of Chin et al. (US 6470277 B1).

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) is applied as above.

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) does not teach the limitations that gene family data associated with the gene sequence is read by the computer, and the set of primer selection rules includes a second rule specifying that the primer pair data be excluded from the gene family data.

Chin et al. teaches a method of processing gene sequence data comprising the reading of gene family data associated with a gene sequence by the computer and excluding primer pair data from the gene family data (see at least Fig. 7; col. 2, lines 20-33; col. 14, lines 9-26; and col. 19, lines 39-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the computerized reading of gene family data associated with a gene sequence into the method of Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) described above, while excluding primer pair data, since the reading of gene family data can be used for "identifying genes which might trigger, prevent, ameliorate, or somehow affect a variety of diseases or physiological states" (col. 1, lines 33-36), while the reading of primer pair data (i.e., primer sequence and primer annealing temperature) per se does not contribute to the identification of disease genes and their associated mutations/polymorphisms in the same way that gene family data does, that is, through textual analysis to extract disease-related information and correlations from a pre-existing knowledgebase, rather than through physical analysis as when utilizing primers in a laboratory test to acquire new information through direct experimentation.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) and Vijg et al. (US 5814491 A), in view of Chin et al. (US 6470277 B1).

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) and Vijg et al. (US 5814491 A) are applied as above.

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) and Vijg et al. (US 5814491 A) do not teach the limitations that gene family data associated with the gene sequence is read by the computer, and the set of primer selection rules includes a second rule specifying that the primer pair data be excluded from the gene family data.

Chin et al. teaches a method of processing gene sequence data comprising the reading of gene family data associated with a gene sequence by the computer and excluding primer pair data from the gene family data (see at least Fig. 7; col. 2, lines 20-33; col. 14, lines 9-26; and col. 19, lines 39-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the computerized reading of gene family data associated with a gene sequence into the methods of Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) and Vijg et al. (US 5814491 A) described above, while excluding primer pair data, since the reading of gene family data can be used for "identifying genes which might trigger, prevent, ameliorate, or somehow affect a variety of diseases or physiological states" (col. 1, lines 33-36), while the reading of primer pair data (i.e., primer sequence and primer annealing temperature) per se does not contribute to the identification of disease genes and their associated mutations/polymorphisms in the same way that gene family data does, that is, through textual analysis to extract disease-related information and correlations from a pre-existing knowledgebase, rather than through physical analysis as when utilizing primers in a laboratory test to acquire new information through direct experimentation.

Claim 5-6 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A), in view of Giordano et al. (US 5807681 A).

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) is applied as above.

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) does not teach sequencing the plurality of amplified coding sequences to produce a plurality of nucleotide base identifier strings, wherein the plurality of nucleotide base identifier strings includes nucleotide base identifiers represented by the letters G, A, T, and C.

Giordano et al. (US 5807681 A) teaches a method of processing gene sequence data comprising sequencing of amplified coding sequences to produce nucleotide base identifier strings, wherein the nucleotide base identifier strings include nucleotide base identifiers represented by the letters G, A, T, and C (see Fig. 2; col. 10, lines 20-27; col. 12, lines 30-41; and col. 5, lines 54-67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art incorporate the sequencing of the amplified coding sequences to produce nucleotide base identifier strings represented by the letters G, A, T, and C within the method of Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A), since Giordano et al. teaches that for analyzing polymorphisms/mutations in amplified gene segments "one must still sequence the sample segment...and the sequence of the segment must be compared to the nucleotide sequence for the corresponding wild type in order to determine the exact location and nature of the mutation, i.e., point mutation, deletion or insertion" (col. 12, lines 30-42).

Claims 7-13, 21-27, 29-34, and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) and Giordano et al. in view of Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1) and Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6475736 B1).

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) and Giordano et al. are applied as above.

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A) and Giordano et al. do not teach the limitations of claims 7-13, 21-27, 29-34, and 36-41.

Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1) teaches a method and encoded computer-readable medium for processing gene sequence data and haplotyping by computer comprising reading a plurality of nucleotide base identifier strings; positionally aligning a plurality of nucleotide base

Art Unit: 1631

identifier strings to produce a plurality of aligned nucleotide base identifier strings; comparing aligned nucleotide base identifiers at each nucleotide base position of the plurality of aligned nucleotide base identifier strings; at each nucleotide base position where a difference amongst aligned nucleotide base identifiers exists: reading nucleotide base quality information associated with the aligned nucleotide base identifiers where the difference exists, comparing the nucleotide base quality information with predetermined qualification data, and if the quality information meets the predetermined qualification data and is accepted, providing and storing resulting data that identifies where the difference amongst the aligned base identifiers exists; wherein the resulting data comprise SNP identification data; wherein, after providing and storing all resulting data that identifies where the differences amongst the aligned nucleotide base identifiers exist, at each nucleotide base position where a difference exists comparing the nucleotide base identifier with a prestored nucleotide base identifier to identify whether the nucleotide base identifier is a variant, and providing and storing additional resulting data that identifies whether the nucleotide base identifier is a variant, wherein the additional resulting data comprises haplotype identification data (see at least Fig. 5 and 7; col. 7, lines 34-50; col. 3, lines 8-49; col. 12, lines 14-18; col. 5, lines 12-42; col. 7, lines 51-59).

Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1) does not teach the limitations of visually displaying, from the computer, nucleotide base quality information for acceptance or rejection, and that the nucleotide base quality information comprises one or more phred values.

Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6475736 B1) teaches a method of processing gene sequence data and haplotyping comprising visually displaying, from the computer, nucleotide base quality

Art Unit: 1631

information for acceptance or rejection, and that the nucleotide base quality information comprises one or more phred values (col. 66, lines 39-55).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the analysis of sequence variations by alignment, comparison, qualification, and validation as taught by Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1) and Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6475736 B1) above, since Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1) teaches that a haplotyping method which allows "identification of gene sequence variances within genes that may be involved in drug action is important for determining whether a given drug or other therapy may be safe and effective in an individual patient...[and] useful in connection with predicting differences in response to treatment and selection of appropriate treatment of a disease or condition" (col. 2, lines 45-55), while Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6475736 B1) teaches that use of a viewer on the computer allows one "to visually inspect the data and verify variances" and that the use of the PHRED program to assign phred values to DNA sequencing reaction results allows "the quality of DNA sequencing reactions [to be] assessed automatically and numerically scored" and then easily analyzed for acceptability based upon a predetermined phred quality score level (col. 66, lines 40-51).

Claims 14, 28, 35, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A), Giordano et al., Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1), and Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6475736 B1), in view of McKernan et al. or Dolfing.

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A), Giordano et al., Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1), and Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6475736 B1) are applied as above.

Art Unit: 1631

Vijg et al. (US 6007231 A), Giordano et al., Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6401043 B1), and Stanton Jr. et al. (US 6475736 B1) do not teach providing and storing a binary value of '0' for those nucleotide base identifiers that are identified as variants and a binary value of '1' for those nucleotide base identifiers that are not.

McKernan et al. (see at least col. 17, lines 48-51) and Dolfing (see at least col. 2, lines 43-55) both teach providing and storing binary values of '0' or '1' for positive (yes) and negative (no) Boolean decisions.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide and store binary values of '0' and '1' for nucleotide base identifiers that are either identified as variants (yes) or not (no), since McKernan et al. or Dolfing both independently demonstrate that binary values are routinely assigned to Boolean operators such as 'yes' and 'no' when providing and storing these type of answers made to queries contained within methods executed through computerized algorithms.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew A. Kenedy whose telephone number is 703-305-4842.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on 703-308-4028. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4842.

Application/Control Number: 09/964,059

Page 11

Art Unit: 1631

AAK

Nov. 12, 2003

*Marianne P. Allen*  
MARIANNE P. ALLEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800  
*1631*